

Kennesaw State University

DigitalCommons@Kennesaw State University

Master of Arts in Professional Writing
Capstones

Professional Writing

Summer 10-24-1991

Remote Working During the Pandemic: MAPW Graduates in the Workforce

Jordan Dollar
jdollar7@students.kennesaw.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.kennesaw.edu/mapw_etd



Part of the [Technical and Professional Writing Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Dollar, Jordan, "Remote Working During the Pandemic: MAPW Graduates in the Workforce" (1991). *Master of Arts in Professional Writing Capstones*. 92.
https://digitalcommons.kennesaw.edu/mapw_etd/92

This Capstone is brought to you for free and open access by the Professional Writing at DigitalCommons@Kennesaw State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master of Arts in Professional Writing Capstones by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@Kennesaw State University. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@kennesaw.edu.

Kennesaw State University

Remote Working During the Pandemic:

MAPW Graduates in the Workforce

Jordan Dollar

PRWR 7960: MAPW Capstone Project

Dr. Lara Smith-Sitton, Dr. Chris Palmer

7 July 2021

MAPWriting

M.A. in Professional Writing at Kennesaw State University

Notice of Capstone Completion Form

Name: Jordan Dollar

KSU#: 000332023

Graduation Semester & Year: Summer 2021

Oral presentation completed on (date): 26 July 2021

Title: "Remote Working During the Pandemic: MAPW Graduates in the Workforce"

Faculty Advisory Committee

Print Name

Signature

Member Chris Palmer

Member Lara Smith-Sitton

DocuSigned by:
Jordan Dollar
735719338665...

Student Signature

DocuSigned by:
Chris Palmer
DocuSigned by:
Lara Smith-Sitton
CB1820C41C67436...

July 27, 2021

Date

MAPW Graduate Director Approval

DocuSigned by:
Jany Grooms
58B952F0D8914E9...

Signature

July 27, 2021

Date

Bring original to Terri Brennen (EB 163) who will route to Jennifer Oglesby in Admissions. Admissions will update your Degree Works record, not the MAPW personnel. Usually this is done after graduation.

Table of Contents

1.	Abstract	1
2.	Chapter One: Introduction	3
3.	Chapter Two: Initial Findings	6
3.1.	Introduction	6
3.2.	The Current State	8
3.3.	Impact of WFH.....	12
3.4.	Success Factors	15
3.5.	Future of WFH	17
3.6.	Summation	20
4.	Chapter Three: Methods and Methodology	22
4.1.	Introduction	22
4.2.	Interviews	22
4.3.	Questions	24
5.	Chapter Four: Secondary Findings	26
5.1.	General Experience	26
5.2.	Success Factors	28
5.3.	Overall Well-Being	30
5.4.	Employee Support Systems.....	32
5.5.	Post-Pandemic Preferences	33
6.	Chapter Five: Discussion	36
6.1.	Graduate Preferences.....	36
6.2.	The Role of Distractions	38

6.3.	Employer Responsibility	39
6.4.	Impactful Circumstances	40
6.5.	Initial Research Connections.....	42
7.	Chapter Six: Conclusion	46
8.	Works Cited	48
9.	Acknowledgement	51
10.	Resume.....	52

1. Abstract

From early 2020 to 2021, the COVID-19 pandemic forced millions of employers across the globe to abruptly shift to virtual workspaces to both facilitate safe work environments and offset operational costs in a time of economic uncertainty. This sudden change accelerated the already growing trend of remote working in a rapid fashion and, for many, signaled the start of a new era of professional operations. As one could imagine, this also created a myriad of anxiety and stress for those workers unprepared for the change. Existing research suggests that this change was especially impactful for Generation Z and Generation Y (often referred to as “millennials”) with limited experience in their careers. This capstone seeks to evaluate the causes for potentially reduced success rates among the narrow demographic of graduates from Kennesaw State University’s Master of Arts in Professional Writing (MAPW) program. By interviewing a small selection of recent graduates from the program, this capstone records their experiences working remotely during the pandemic and investigates which factors may have improved or hindered their productivity and happiness. It is important to acknowledge that, while the initial aim of this capstone was to investigate potential generational gaps and determine causes for them, the focus eventually shifted to the more granular study of just recent graduates from the MAPW program and how their experiences were shaped as individuals new to the

workforce. While the findings from this approach could potentially provide insight into generational gaps, it is not the focus of this capstone.

2. Chapter One: Introduction

The coronavirus global pandemic accelerated the process of adopting work-from-home (WFH) policies for organizations across the world, forcing millions of workers to merge their personal environments with professional responsibilities. The change was abrupt, disruptive, and, for many, detrimental to both their mental and physical health, as the stress of an unusual workplace forced workers to rapidly adjust or fall victim to layoffs that were becoming all too common (“State of Remote Work,” 1). This, combined with additional strain brought on by isolation and the aggressive spread of COVID-19, turned the 2020–2021 experience into a brutal blender of unfamiliar challenges and stressful social distancing practices (“Stress in America 2021”).

Yet, research suggests that despite the very sudden implementation of remote workspaces, the shift to WFH policies may have proved more of a boon for workers than a hindrance (“Global Work-from-Home Experience Survey,” 13). While telecommuting faced slower adoption rates prior to the 2020 pandemic, the practice was highly coveted by a majority of workers desiring an alternative to lengthy office commutes and inflexible work schedules (Lister, 128). The practice allowed for a healthier work-life balance and an avoidance of traditional routines that may have drained workers both mentally and financially (133–134). In addition to benefits for individuals, widespread adoption of WFH

policies may bring economic advantages as populations trickle into suburbs and rural communities, bringing with them business and ending city monopolies on commerce (Fried and Hansson, 31).

Unfortunately, challenges brought about by WFH policies persist. Younger workers among the millennial and Z generations were especially negatively affected, as they faced higher levels of stress and voiced the greatest opposition to continued remote working (“Global Work-from-Home Experience Survey,” 14). It was not immediately made clear by existing research whether this was due to a lack of preparedness for telecommuting work styles, gaps established by differences in generational upbringing, or increased layoff rates due to lower levels of experience during a time of economic disruption and general pandemic-induced anxiety (“Stress in America 2021”).

This capstone explores this knowledge gap through by analyzing established WFH-related research and suggests possible causes to disparities in generational upbringing. Secondary research via interviews with graduates from Kennesaw State University’s Master of Arts in Professional Writing (MAPW) program provides insight into how workers entering the field may have fared when compared to more experienced workers in established roles. The graduates, who all faced unique telecommuting challenges after graduating from the program and starting careers in writing, each provide their own perspective in recounting various successes, obstacles, and personal preferences developed after remote working during the pandemic. This capstone follows these experiences with a

discussion of the capstone's findings and provides recommendations for future research on the subject.

3. Chapter Two: Initial Findings

3.1. Introduction

In January 2020, the very first case of COVID-19 in the United States was confirmed in Washington state after a resident returning from Wuhan, China tested positive for the virus. One month later, a woman from Northern California became the first of many fatalities caused by complications from the virus and, one month after that, President Donald J. Trump signed the “Coronavirus Preparedness and Response Supplement Appropriations Act” and declared a national emergency (“Trump Declares National Emergency over Coronavirus”). Shortly after, the World Health Organization (WHO) officially labeled the spread of COVID-19 a pandemic, and governments around the world began enacting measures to slow the virus’ rapid circulation (World Health Organization).

Among these measures were stringent lockdown policies requiring that non-essential businesses and organizations establish social distancing and facemask restrictions or even restrict access entirely, forcing many to adopt hastily prepared procedures to remain in business. Restaurants turned to mobile delivery applications, gyms and theaters strove to introduce safer environments for consumers, and companies across the country sent out notifications to their employees stating that they would be telecommuting or “working from home” (WFH) for the foreseeable future.

The application of these policies has had a mixed effect on workers. According to a study conducted in the global WFH experience by Global Workplace Analytics (GWA), only 68% of responders reported a “very successful” experience while working remotely. The survey results suggest that the remaining percentage struggling with WFH policies were primarily finding difficulty with the social aspect of it; respondents seemed frustrated with an inability to connect with coworkers and managers online, while other causes relating to at-home distractions and a lack of access to the right equipment were negligible in comparison and even significantly less problematic while telecommuting (37). This suggests that the greatest obstacles facing remote workers are related to practices in online communication.

The most concerning find from this survey regards differences between specific demographics and how they have managed the WFH experience. The GWA survey collected responses from Generations X (44% of respondents), Y (31%), and Z (1%), “baby boomers” (22%), and the “Silent” Generation (1%). Generation X refers to those born between 1965 and 1980, Generation Y refers to 1981–1996, and Generation Z refers to 1997–2012. “Baby boomers,” named for the post-World War II baby boom, refers to 1946–1964, while the “Silent” Generation was born between 1928–1945. Despite this variety of generational demographics, those from Generations Y and Z seem to have experienced a notable drop-off when reporting positive experiences. Both baby boomers and Generation X reported higher success rates (73% and 72%, respectively) while only 59% of Generation Y or “millennials” had similar experiences. Generation

Z, meanwhile, saw the lowest success rates of any age group at only 44% (Global Workplace Analytics, May 2020). This could suggest a generational gap in employee WFH success rates that is leaving less-experienced workers vulnerable during the COVID-19 pandemic and potentially while remote working in general.

This capstone will analyze the current state of the telecommuting experience and provide an in-depth summary of modern WFH policies and their impact on workers. Specifically, it dives into these generational gaps to determine why younger generations may be experiencing less success while telecommuting by examining reported success factors among survey respondents and similarly designed reports. This capstone then concludes with a summary of these findings and a call to action suggesting how future employees can be better prepared for the WFH experience.

3.2. The Current State

Even before the pandemic, telecommuting was a rapidly growing phenomenon in modern workplaces. Employees unofficially worked everywhere—in their cars, on their phones, at airports. According to a 2019 study by Kate Lister and Tom Harnish, it is estimated that well over 40% of workers already telecommute “occasionally,” while office desks in the United States are believed to be empty “an average of 40-50 percent of normal working hours.” Of these telecommuters, most have indicated an interest in continuing to do so “at least

some of the time” and a third would even give up a portion of their paycheck for the privilege (128).

Older studies indicate similar findings regarding the growth of telecommuting popularity; in 2017, it was found that the practice had grown 115% over the past decade, “nearly 10 times faster than the rest of the workforce” (2017 State of Telecommuting, 2). Forty percent of employers in the U.S. offer more flexibility in telecommuting, especially for employees 45 years or older who work full-time positions (20). Additionally, telecommuting appears to be most prevalent in “small and mid-sized” cities with a workforce of 300,000 or fewer employees (15). Occupationally, employees are most frequently offered remote opportunities when working in managerial positions and office settings, while workers in the computer, mathematical, and military fields see “disproportionately more” teleworking positions than not (12).

The driving force behind these changes can be attributed to a multitude of factors. Although increasing revenue remains the primary program driver for businesses, “human capital” has risen to become the most valuable measure of success in an organization (“Alternative Workplace Strategies,” 4). This means that businesses are recognizing the need to maintain their employees’ happiness and well-being, leading to greater investments in healthcare offers, office amenities, and telecommuting opportunities. Office spaces are now more “flexible,” resulting in the steady decline of assigned seating (16) and an increase in variable working hours (19), allowing greater management of work/life

conflicts for employees and a dynamic shared working space for those who prefer it to telecommuting.

Additional findings suggest that, while WFH opportunities are one of the more popular adoptions from adapting companies, it is not the only rising method. Organizations now support and, in some cases, pay for the means to change one's workspace, regardless of where it is located. Employees can not only select their seating arrangement but also personalize it and have tools such as standing desks or multiple monitors frequently offered by their employer (32). Barriers to this adoption remain entrenched in organizational culture and managerial concerns (59% and 57% of organizations, respectively) but have otherwise dropped by 38% since 2008 (41). By facilitating these adjustments for their employees, organizations could potentially eliminate many growing pains and provide a smoother experience (and a more productive remote environment) for their workers.

Today, the COVID-19 pandemic has managed to force the hands of those organizations still hesitant to offer telecommuting opportunities. A collaboration between Owl Labs and GWA found that 70% of full-time workers were, at the time of the survey, working from home and, of those now telecommuting, 50% have reported that they will not be returning to positions that do not offer remote work ("State of Remote Work," 3). Telecommuting is "the new norm" and has become essential to job happiness and satisfaction, as 70% of survey respondents have reported (7). Ninety two percent of respondents "expect to work from home" at least once a week. 80% want the opportunity to WFH a minimum of three days

a week (23). With telecommuting rapidly taking over as the preferred method of working, employees have begun to dramatically shift their expectations for new positions.

Adjustment to this situation has varied among demographics. One survey found that 88% of millennials and 88% of men were experiencing the highest measurements of a healthy work-life balance when compared to other generations and genders (“ViyondTheSurface: How COVID-19 has flipped everything on its head”). Women, however, experienced fewer challenges while adapting to hastily enacted WFH policies (18% when compared to 12% of men). The greatest discrepancies appeared when comparing the “baby boomer” generation to millennials and Generation Z. Baby boomers were significantly more likely to report happiness with telecommuting (80%) when compared to millennials (only 60%) and Generation Z (54%) (“#ViyondTheSurface: How COVID-19 has flipped everything on its head”). This supports the findings of the GWA WFH survey described in the introduction, which suggested that younger generations were struggling the most while telecommuting.

While not immediately explainable, this trend could be partially attributed to the role of millennials and Generation Z as what researchers Andrea Hershatter and Molly Epstein called “digital natives” (212). The two theorized that, as millennials have grown up alongside the rise of the Internet, the generation was “wired differently” for responding to visual stimulation and less effective when going without face-to-face interaction and deciphering non-verbal cues (212). While this would suggest an innate affinity for telecommuting rather than an

ineptitude, Hershatter and Epstein argued otherwise, stating that millennials have grown accustomed to easily obtainable information to the point that verifying data has become more of an uncommon nuisance than a routine. The two went on to suggest, that due to a greater dependence on “explicit instructions, well defined criteria for success, and specific deadlines set by others” and a significant disconnect from the support systems provided by coworkers and an active collaborative environment, millennials and Generation Z were struggling more than older groups (216).

3.3. Impact of WFH

According to the aforementioned survey from GWA, the benefits of greater WFH adoption are considerable. Forty-four percent of respondents reported significant to moderate financial savings while telecommuting, while only 8% claimed to have experienced no financial benefit at all (“Global Work-from-Home Experience Survey,” 32). More than three quarters of respondents (77%) responded positively to questions regarding greater flexibility in work/life balance and overall well-being, over half (54%) reported healthier eating habits, and nearly as many claimed to be exercising more (44%) (34). Telecommuters also saved substantial time out of their days by avoiding commuting, allowing for additional savings in time and money. The survey estimates that this prevented as many as 154,000 vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and \$8,000 per 100 employees annually (56).

GWA calculated benefits from a managerial perspective as well.

Employees saw a rise in productivity by a staggering 21%, resulting in over \$1.4 million in savings per 100 employees (60). Despite the common misconception that at-home work environments are more prone to distractions, telecommuters observed far fewer interruptions per day than experienced while working in an office (43 interruptions per day versus 78) (63). Employers have taken note of these benefits too; 74% of CFOs say that their organizations will reduce office space due to employee adaption to WFH policies and preferences (73).

In her testimony before the United States Senate regarding these findings, GWA President Kate Lister stated that, although the COVID-19 pandemic did not start the teleworking trend, “it will dramatically accelerate it” as organizations continue to observe increasing benefits (1). She also advised that “Common drivers [of recent WFH prioritization] include increasing agility, enhancing productivity, reducing greenhouse gases, improving employee engagement, reducing employee stress, and improving disaster preparedness” (2). Lister referred to the Telework Enhancement Act of 2010 as an example, which supported telework goals by requiring agencies to encourage program participation and report impacts. The “Federal Work-Life Survey” (FWLS) and “Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey” (FEVS) similarly documented “significant positive impacts on people” as telecommuters were reported more engaged, satisfied, and less likely to leave their organizations than non-telecommuters (3).

Future widespread adoption of telecommuting practices could have significant effects on the monopolization of high-salaried positions in cities, as the

opening of businesses to a wider range of employees via remote work allows organizations to begin spreading into suburbs and rural areas. Fried and Hansson indicated the globalization of talent, stating that it “isn’t bound by location anymore. Businesses can hire anyone, no matter where they are” (31). This migration would result in further savings for businesses in the form of reduced real estate costs and significantly decreased office space. A wider pool of potential employees would also allow for far greater flexibility in hiring suitable candidates, rather than selecting from geographically limited ranges (32).

Telecommuters stand to benefit financially both from savings due to reduced commuting and other expenses and through increased income. According to the “2017 State of Telecommuting” Report, employees that spend only half their workdays WFH saved over \$11,000 per year. Across the entirety of the work-at-home population, this could potentially amount to \$44 billion in annual savings, and if the telecommuting workforce were to expand to include those who both could and would WFH, savings would increase to nearly \$689 billion per year (3). The average income of telecommuters is also \$4,000 higher than that of non-telecommuters, though whether this can be attributed to the method in which they commute is questionable (2). More recent findings from GWA state that, of those respondents who worked remotely during the COVID-19 pandemic, only 8% reported no savings at all, 19% reported minimal savings, and 73% reported small to significant financial savings from reduced expenses on gas, transportation, fast food, and other variables (“Global Work-from-Home Experience Survey,” 32).

Despite these benefits, evidence indicates that satisfaction with the WFH lifestyle is significantly reduced among millennials and Generation Z employees. The GWA WFH survey acknowledges a substantial drop-off in average preferred days per week WFH following baby boomers (2.4) and Generation X (2.5) employees. For comparison, Generation Z employees prefer only 1.4 days or fewer while WFH (29). In *Remote: Office Not Required*, Jason Fried and David H. Hansson admit to a trade-off when telecommuting: “there are times when nothing beats talking to your manager in person or sitting in a room with your colleagues, brainstorming the next big thing . . . eventually, you’re likely to feel a loss” (43). These findings suggest that dissatisfaction in WFH practices could be causing younger workers to miss out on financial savings and improved productivity while also incurring additional costs from their employers.

3.4. *Success Factors*

For purposes of this capstone, “success” will be defined as the accomplishment of a professional’s goals while remote working in a manner that can be considered either improved or at least in-line with previous, non-remote productivity and overall happiness. Success while remote working can vary and can be attributed to several factors. WFH employees appear to experience fewer distractions, enhanced focus, and improved creativity and innovative skills, but do suffer when collaborating with coworkers, managing their teams, and serving or supporting customers and clients (Global Workplace Analytics, 20).

Telecommuters overall reported having access to suitable spaces to work from (76% of respondents) and could isolate themselves from domestic activities and

distractions (70%), though many admitted to feelings of loneliness and isolation (42%) (17). These findings suggest that the primary driver of positive WFH performance is self-discipline and the primary impediment to performance is in how teams approach remote collaboration and socialization.

Despite limited access to office amenities, telecommuters are only partially impeded by a lack of work equipment. Sit-stand desks (59% in-office versus 22% at home), dual monitors (78% in-office versus 46% at home), and ergonomic chairs (83% in-office versus 42% at home) were among those most frequently reported missing, yet 72% of GWA survey respondents claimed to have access to everything they needed to be successful (15). Eighty-one percent reported satisfaction with the availability and readiness of technology on average (18). This supports the notion that employees do not significantly struggle when WFH due to technological limitations or unavailable equipment.

In an excerpt from Kate Lister's "Telework in the 21st Century," it is stated that the implementation of telework programs and their management are among the primary determining factors when allowing for WFH practices in an organization (155). The excerpt emphasized in particular the availability of training in both technology use and remote work to allow for easier transition to telecommuting, in addition to providing "opportunities for remote workers to engage, face to face, with coworkers on an occasional basis" (156). Lister goes on to note that organizational impacts are at their peak when managers, coworkers, and senior management are supportive of telework policies (157).

Fried and Hansson, meanwhile, warn against one of the “dragons” of telecommuting in the form of “cabin fever,” or isolation from human interactions due to prolonged remote work. “Human interactions are important because we are social animals at heart. This is why it’s important to still go into the office every now and then or venture out into parks, libraries, or coffee shops” (119). The two recommend the implementation of a “virtual water cooler” to improve team bonding and cohesiveness and suggest researching apps that encourage sharing and off-topic discussion (100). Though this particular risk of remote work will likely be significantly reduced following the eventual conclusion to the COVID-19 pandemic and the end of social distancing, facilitating employee bonds will remain a valuable practice for telecommuting companies in the future.

3.5. *Future of WFH*

In her testimony before the United States Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, Kate Lister outlined the need for widespread telework policy adoption following the “tipping point” that has been the COVID-19 pandemic. Lister stated that demand for WFH employees would increase, fear regarding WFH policies would drastically reduce, and that there would be “increased attention to the potential impact of work-from-home on sustainability” (“Learned from Remote Working during COVID-19: Can the Government Save Money Through Maximizing Efficient Use of Leased Space?” 7). Listed argued that “The way we’ve been working for the last several decades is unsustainable.

We need to go beyond thinking about remote work as merely a tactical solution to the problem du jour” (9).

That is not to say that there are not disadvantages and opportunities for exploitation of telecommuters, however. Lister reminded the Committee of IBM’s response to remote work policies, which was to significantly roll WFH policies back following the declaration of “safe” office space in the pandemic.

Teleworkers that had already been working remotely for years were suddenly told to commute to one of the organization’s twelve offices. Lister called it “highly suspect” and argued that the way remote workers were recalled forced many to quit rather than relocate and allowed the company to save profits in hiring new teams (8). Lister also warned against placing cost reduction over people, stating that “cramming more people into smaller spaces” has “disappointed” those organizations attempting such practices (3). True success stories stem from programs that embraced teleworking and workplace flexibility as “strategic imperatives” (3). Programs that enabled telecommuting practices needed to be “supported from the top” and “deployed as a collaboration” between organizational resources, labor unions, employee groups, and any other relevant stake holders to enable productive remote working environments (3).

For professionals interested in beginning their own telecommuting practices, successful implementation tends to be dependent on personal boundaries and, again, self-discipline. Jason Fried and David H. Hansson recommend the application of a strict routine that does not significantly differ from in-office habits, such as professional garb and good hygiene (209-11). The

two emphasize the need to stay motivated, calling it the “fuel of intellectual work” (221) and recommend that employees practice “nomadic” freedom by frequenting different spaces of work, including coffee shops or parks, different personal spaces available within one’s own home, and even the office itself. “Routine has a tendency to numb your creativity,” they argued. Following the same routine every day “isn’t exactly a prescription for inspiration” (228).

In a series of surveys conducted by GWA, Advanced Workplace Associates (AWA), and Haworth, Inc., it was determined that the “Steady increase in on-site flexible and public spaces may indicate . . . a move toward more activity-based working” (Alternative Workplace Strategies, 17). In the context of this report, activity-based working refers to the availability of flexible work settings and tools to facilitate effective workplace practices. Alternative Workplace Strategies (AWS) recommends taking advantage of the pandemic to implement such workstyles to allow organizations and their employees the opportunity “to experiment so you’ll be ready when the next economic downturn or crisis occurs” (17).

The surveys also found that flexibility in working hours is imperative to helping employees manage their work/life conflicts. To acquire and retain talent, employers are now offering increasingly flexible schedules for employees. The AWS report suggested that organizations immediately begin offering wider ranges of flexible options, and that, although “utilization may be low among some offerings,” research supports the notion that even having the option can increase employee happiness and retention. “To the extent possible, work to make options

available to everyone equally and make sure people understand what is offered” (19).

Though somewhat dated, the “2017 State of Telecommuting” Report concludes with its own suggestions. The report recommends that the creation of employee resource groups or “ERGs” within organizations for telecommuters to help and support each other and the programs themselves. Also helpful is for telecommuters to discuss the practice with their professional networks to dispel popular myths and encourage widespread adoption. The report went on to argue that “we’ve reached the point where the focus is no longer on whether telecommuting is just a momentary trend but is instead on its widespread acceptance and long-term sustainability” (26). By implementing these practices, organizations can paint an ideal portrait of virtual success. Failing to do so would only waste an opportunity and all the resources—human or otherwise—involved in the experience.

3.6. *Summation*

An interest in investing in human capital for a new generation of professionals was the leading factor for the development of telecommuting policies before 2020, yet the COVID-19 pandemic has resulted in global adoption of hastily constructed WFH practices. Now, as the organizations struggle to perfect their implementation, it has become apparent that remote work may be here to stay due to a wealth of benefits to both the financial interests of

companies, the practical advantages for employees, and the greater benefits for the environment, economy, and workplace culture.

Yet, telecommuting is not without its obstacles. Despite the value of WFH practices, many employees face challenges with collaborative projects and managerial duties. Though the implementation of effective communication tools and cloud-based software storage may eventually solve most of these problems, loneliness still afflicts many workers, especially among millennials and younger generations. If organizations are to embrace change and approach telecommuting with a reasonable expectation of success, then further research into the cause of these issues will be necessary before widespread adoption can truly begin. For that purpose, the research materials summarized throughout this white paper—specifically the Global Work-from-Home Experience Survey conducted by GWA, “Alternative Workplace Strategies,” and Fried and Hansson’s *Remote: Office Not Required*—would be valuable resources to consider.

4. Chapter Three: Methods and Methodology

4.1. Introduction

This section provides an outline of the methods used to collect secondary resource for this capstone. It explains the methods used, which took the form of individual interviews with graduates from the Kennesaw State University MAPW program. This section explains the questions asked during the interviews and elaborates on the justification for them. The tools used to record and transcribe the interviews, the professional and academic background of the graduates, and the intent of the questions themselves are all covered in this section.

4.2. Interviews

I contacted four different graduates from the MAPW program at Kennesaw State University to record their experiences during the 2020 coronavirus pandemic and determine how they fared, how their personal preferences with regards to remote working were shaped, and what practices they adopted during the period. Graduate were selected based on whether they had worked remotely partially or entirely during the pandemic. All graduates were recent graduates from the program, having completed their capstone projects and graduated during the Fall 2019 or Spring 2020 semesters.

While these graduates had started new jobs after graduation, all of them had worked prior to graduation as graduate research assistants or with the Kennesaw State University Writing Center. In some cases, these graduates had only worked remotely for the first few months of the pandemic before returning to their office setting. Others had worked remotely for the entirety of their current (at the time of the interviews) jobs and had yet to meet their coworkers in-person. Any factors unrelated to the WFH experience—such as the graduate’s nationality, race, career or education experience, or other background characteristics – were not considered for their selection and were not examined in the post-interview analyses.

I then scheduled individual interviews with the four graduates at a time and date of their preference. We met over the course of two weeks, one meeting per person, to conduct the interviews. The meetings were held over Microsoft Teams with users opting to use webcams or not. I utilized Open Broadcaster Software to record the second half of each meeting to preserve interview responses that were too lengthy to write down at the time. The graduates were made aware of this and agreed to the audio being recorded. These recordings were later deleted after I had transcribed responses to Microsoft Word. Any potentially identifiable information—such as the graduates’ names, employers, or details that could possibly be used to identify their business of employment or identity—were removed from these transcripts at this point.

4.3. *Questions*

I asked the graduates twenty questions in total. Before asking the first ten, I informed the graduates that they could answer on a scale of 1–5, with 1 equaling “Not at all,” and 5 equaling “Very much.” I made a point to mention that longer elaboration was allowed and that, if the graduates found themselves uncomfortable or otherwise unwilling to answer anything, they were similarly welcome to skip questions or even cancel the interview if necessary. This was true for the second half of the interview as well, which comprised of an additional ten questions. These were short answer and open-ended. For example, the first question asked the graduate if their job was dependent upon regular collaboration with their colleagues and, if so, how that had been affected.

I wrote the questions with the intention of comparing how graduates in my own program had handled the pandemic with the results of the Global Work-from-Home Experience Survey from Global Workplace Analytics. Other sources of research on the subject as summarized in my white paper were also considered. My questions emphasized relationships with coworkers, mitigating and enabling factors to performance, general drivers of success in the remote workplace, and the development of the graduates’ overall feelings with regards to the WFH experience. I wanted to measure the reasons for success as much as the successes themselves, and to understand if gaps could be measured in our generation’s capabilities or if performance factors were most negatively affected by the circumstances in which remote work had been so widely adopted. Over time, the focus narrowed from a broad generational study to a more granular look at the

graduates themselves and how their trials and successes could be interpreted for future students to benefit from.

5. Chapter Four: Secondary Findings

5.1. General Experience

The interviewed graduates from the MAPW program appear to have had an overall mixed experience while WFH during the COVID-19 pandemic. For the purposes of accurately separating my findings while maintain anonymity for the respondents, I will refer to the candidates as Graduates A, B, C, and D. Two of the four (A and B) seemed to have generally positive feelings regarding the experience, despite it having been overshadowed by widespread anxiety and uncertainty induced by stay-at-home orders and social distancing. Graduate C reported that they did not have strong feelings for WFH or in-office policies one way or the other and that they did not particularly care if workers returned to in-person routines once safety was assured. Graduate C did indicate a preference for a “blended” approach that allowed for a limited number of remote days, however. The final candidate, Graduate D, reported an unpleasant experience and was relieved to return to the office, stating that remote working had caused them stress, negatively impacted their professional and personal productivity, and had either not affected or poorly affected their physical and mental well-being. It was Graduate D who had returned to the office early during the pandemic and had remained there for the bulk of 2020 after working remotely for only three months. The others still held remote positions at the time of our interviews.

Before the pandemic, the graduates were mostly experienced with some level of remote working or learning and had some level of preparedness for the situation ahead of time, due to a familiarity with remote working technology. As mentioned previously, they had all obtained positions working for KSU in the past as graduate research assistants or working for the Kennesaw State University Writing Center. These positions allowed for the graduates to experience remote working to limited degrees, with varying levels of access to the practice. All had taken classes in the past that included remote learning components, though the graduates expressed the belief that these experiences were less effective than in-person classes. Graduate B suggested that the MAPW program might have prepared them more, though they also admitted that college courses were naturally more impactful when conducted face-to-face due to the nature of academic discourse and learning and did not elaborate further on the suggestion. It is also important to note the distinction between “remote working” and “online learning.” The former equates synchronous working towards a common goal in a collaborative environment, whereas the latter refers to asynchronous learning, or learning that is undertaken individually and rarely at the same time or in cooperation with one’s peers. While online classes do sometimes meet in a remote, virtual environment, the similarities between telework and online academia tend to end there.

5.2. *Success Factors*

Graduates did share similar feelings regarding mitigating factors in the remote workplace, mostly citing the presence of distractions as a detriment to their productivity. Two referenced wandering household pets as occasional interruptions to their ability to focus. All four respondents shared their residencies with roommates or partners that, while also working remotely, often held voice-over-IP (VoIP) calls that either required the graduates to adjust their noise levels or distracted the graduates from their own work. Graduates A and D admitted to struggling with temptations from video game consoles and other forms of entertainment while working. Graduate A referred to the practice of “keeping myself accountable” as a constant battle and would later admit to occasionally taking work off early when none of their assigned tasks required immediate attention. Graduates C and D cited a lack of access to the tools and technology they needed as a mitigating factor, with C specifically referring to “limited screen space” after having worked with multiple monitors in their office. This was in direct contrast with the other two respondents, who stated that their employers had kept them outfitted with any tools they needed to accomplish their assigned responsibilities.

Enabling factors appeared to have come from a wider variety of sources. Graduate A stated that their organization was “very collaborative and team-oriented” and that it was due to these characteristics that the graduate could depend on others for support whenever necessary. Graduate A also referred to this as the reason for maintaining accountability when faced with the aforementioned

temptations, stating that “it sort of energizes me to get stuff done. Like, let’s make good on these promises.” Graduate B, meanwhile, referred to the absence of distractions from in-office coworkers and activities as a positive factor when remote working. The temptation to socialize and the presence of ambient office noise were detrimental to Graduate B’s productivity while working in-person and not, B indicated, a characteristic they would miss. In an amusing contrast with this statement, Graduate C claimed that being able to talk loudly to themselves at home while ruminating over a challenging task was a notable benefit for their productivity. Only the fourth respondent, Graduate D, appeared to not know many supporting factors to WFH, eventually stating after some time that schedule flexibility was “the only thing that I really benefited from.”

When asked about success factors for an overall workplace—whether it be virtual or in-office—the graduates appear to have mostly shared feelings on the topic. Graduates A and B referenced weekly meetings that allowed them to link up with their coworkers and align their goals for the week, providing insight into the state of the organization as a whole and giving employees much-needed direction. Graduate A referred to this as “fostering engagement,” stating that “It’s very easy for these companies to be sit back and be like, ‘Do your work!’ and then . . . that’s it, right? You have to maintain a human connection if you want to see some productivity.” Graduate C referred to active management that made itself available for support as a strong factor to their organization’s efficiency. Graduate D similarly referenced “affirmation,” calling it the “carrot on the stick”

for their productivity and stating that the availability of feedback and various forms of validation for their work were significant drivers of success.

5.3. *Overall Well-Being*

All graduates were asked whether they felt the 2020–2021 WFH experience had positively or negatively affected their overall well-being, including their financial status and physical health. Financially, all graduates either noted no impact or reported saving a significant portion of their income from commute avoidance and access to their personal kitchen over fast food. Variation crept in, however, when the graduates were asked about how physical impacts had affected them. Some claimed no notable effect to their health while others admitted to gaining weight or facing much higher levels of stress. Two cited the turbulent nature of the 2020 U.S. Presidential Election and the generally stressful atmosphere accompanying the pandemic, which destabilized the economy and threatened the livelihoods of millions of people. It was due to the fact that remote working only took off in such a spectacular fashion because of COVID-19 that it became somewhat difficult to separate WFH experiences from such severe strain-inducing factors.

Graduate D notably cited uncertainty leading up to the 2020 election as a significant stressor when combined with social distancing and mask mandates, a rising COVID-19 case count, and general disruption to their regular routines. Graduate A shared similar feelings when asked about health impacts, reporting a need for a standing desk after experiencing back problems, “weak legs,” and

weight gain from a lack of access to the gym and reduced physical activity while working. Graduates B and C, however, reported the opposite. Graduate C said that, because of improved schedule flexibility and the lack of a commute, they now had time to exercise in the morning before work. Graduate B also referenced the commute as a reason for ditching fast food and depending more on their home produce, which served as an effective means of maintaining a healthy weight. It was these same factors—commute avoidance and fewer fast-food orders—that stimulated financial savings, which all but one graduate reported were increased during the pandemic.

Graduate respondents reported different feelings about their newly merged work-life balance as well. Graduate A claimed to be very pleased about the situation but noted a growing blur between work hours and personal time. Graduate A stated that disconnecting from work applications frequently failed to serve as an official “end” their workday, remarking that urgent messages through mobile messaging applications or email were a regular occurrence even in the evening or on weekends. Graduate B made similar points, agreeing that technology made it difficult to disconnect but that they felt safer taking breaks or tending to personal responsibilities during work hours. Graduate C claimed that the question was “not really applicable” due to their position requiring constant flexibility but did not elaborate further, while Graduate D joined the first two in bemoaning the lack of a clear line between work and non-work hours. Graduate D called this a “never-ending timeline,” asking how one could “home-from-work”

after WFH, and suggested that a structured schedule with clearly defined hours was preferable to an inconsistent one.

5.4. *Employee Support Systems*

The feelings of the graduates' employers towards WFH policies appear to match existing research on the subject. All respondents reported that employers in previous jobs were resistant to remote working prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, though this saw some variation when starting new jobs in 2020. Graduate B, for example, worked for an employer that was adamantly opposed to the idea. The graduate's next job, in stark contrast, was with an organization that had been remote for the entirety of its existence and had obviously never opposed the policy. For the most part, however, all previous employers for the interviewed graduates opposed WFH policies except in unique circumstances requiring an employee to temporarily work remotely. It was only after social distancing mandates came into effect in the U.S. that attitude among employers appears to have shifted dramatically. Graduates A, B, and C all reported high levels of support from their employers while WFH. Graduate A called it "unexpectedly terrific." Graduate D stated that they received little support but unfortunately offered little elaboration on the subject beyond their initial response.

When asked about the feelings of their managers specifically, all graduates reported acceptable to high levels of trust. Graduate A joked that it was "almost terrifying" how hands-off their manager was, stating that "it's making me have

anxiety!” Graduate B also reported a trusting relationship and attributed this to active communication and weekly check-in calls through which the two could collaborate and plan, and then went on to state that “[Her employer] trusts me to get the work done. There’s no micromanaging really. It’s so nice.” Graduates C and D both stated that their managers trusted them a reasonable amount, responding to the question with a three out of five. When speaking about a previous position that abruptly shifted to a remote environment, Graduate D reported a lack of collaboration, calling it “very lonely” and stating that they were largely independent.

5.5. *Post-Pandemic Preferences*

I concluded each interview with a series of retrospective questions asking the respondent to consider WFH during the pandemic and their feelings about it now that organizations are beginning to reopen their offices. While Graduate D stated with conviction that the experience was overall a negative one, the others’ shared different opinions. Graduate A suggested that they would try and find a new job if their current one attempted to force employees to return and stated that they “can’t even fathom how [the graduate] could go back to that.” Graduate B called it a very positive experience, citing commute avoidance as a greatly improved work-life balance. Graduate C similarly referenced the lack of a commute and mentioned independence from fast food as a strong benefit, remarking that “it’s been wonderful.”

Fortunately for each respondent, it seemed that their employers intended to satisfy their employee's preferences; only Graduate D, who had returned to the office in mid-2020, would continue working in-person for the foreseeable future. As expected, D found this a preferable arrangement, stating that "I do see some benefit to the hybrid model . . . I've actually talked to my employer about possibly working once every two weeks or once a month from home . . . I think that separation from the office is a good thing every now and then. Just not permanently." The others, who were still working remotely at the time of our interviews, expected their policies to continue for the remainder of the year at least. Both Graduates A and B remarked that they might miss out on opportunities to socialize and befriend their coworkers, but that they greatly preferred the WFH experience to previous routines. Graduate C, who will also be continuing to work remotely, suggested that resistance to flexible work location policies could be attributed to organizational image: "I think the way the system is set up... they want to be viewed as large, to have a big employee number or business or building. I think it'll be going in the opposite direction for at least another 10 years."

Commute avoidance, which was raised repeatedly throughout the interviews, was the subject of some last-minute conversations as well. Graduate A stated that "if I never have to get into a car again, I'd be happy." Graduate B expressed a similar preference, remarking that "I love the fact that work hours are for work and once that's over, I don't have to deal with traffic to get home. I can immediately start my outside-of-work life." Graduate C called it the most

important factor to continued remote working. Graduate D, however, did not consider commute avoidance to be significant in their feelings about WFH.

I concluded with a final question asking the responding graduates how they felt about the possibility of “blended workspaces” in which employees could come and go at leisure, taking their work home or to the office when necessary or preferred. This was met with some skepticism from Graduate C due to the possibility of offices either going completely unused or being vacant enough that business owners could potentially not justify the cost. Overall, however, the respondents seemed pleased with the notion. Graduate A responded that, now that organizations had seen the effectiveness of WFH policies firsthand, there was “very little value” to implementing a mandatory in-office attendance policy. They would go on to suggest factoring in the employee’s track record if necessary, when considering blended schedules, but that overall there was little reason to oppose it. Graduates B and D both stated that allowing employees the opportunity to go with their preferred medium of employment would improve productivity and improve their own personal well-being without infringing on the preferences of their coworkers.

6. Chapter Five: Discussion

6.1. Graduate Preferences

These interviews are indicative of too small a sample size to infer significant data regarding the experiences of an entire generation faced with WFH challenges. Over time, my questions and research narrowed to suit this discovery; I avoided asking the graduates which age bracket they would fall into and restructured an initial draft of my questions to disregard the topic. Instead, graduate responses and subsequent research offered insight for employers tasked with managing remote workers and graduates or employees who can expect to work remotely in the future. All graduates seem to have gravitated towards roles that allowed them to work in their preferred setting, whether that be blended, on-site, or entirely remote. The three who were content with the WFH experience continued to work remotely throughout the pandemic and, in the case of one graduate faced with the possibility of being sent back to the office, openly discussed finding another job should they be forced to return to in-person arrangements. The fourth, Graduate D, who regularly expressed discontent and frustration with remote working, was pleased to report a return to normalcy, having begun working in their office again only a few months into the 2020 pandemic. This tendency for these graduates to adopt positions in a comfortable

setting suggests that workers, when faced with an undesirable working arrangement, will similarly either seek to arrange a more

appealing policy with their employer or even begin searching for new positions that allow them to work remotely or in-person, per their personal preference.

It is difficult to determine how much of the interviewed graduates' preferences were established by their previous experiences while remote working. All graduates had experienced either a limited amount of WFH policies with previous job roles or remote learning via online college courses. Few made any reference to these experiences, however, when discussing their feelings about remote working during the pandemic. As mentioned previously, the distinction between remote learning and remote working is too significant to draw much of a correlation between the two. That said, the graduates were specifically asked if their education in the MAPW program could have better prepared them for the situation. Responses were either noncommittal or outright disagreed with the notion, however. The graduates stated that they had almost always preferred learning in-person, which suggests a contrast with their feelings about remote working that is supported by my previous assertion regarding the difference between the two practices. One could infer that experiences in learning remotely might not play an important role for MAPW graduates entering the workforce.

6.2. *The Role of Distractions*

It was no surprise to learn that distractions were the most frequently mentioned inhibiting factor to remote working. All four graduates stated that the presence of roommates, household pets, and tempting hobbies were potential

detriments to their job responsibilities, though none brought up specific examples of when these distractions had played a significant role in poor performance. In fact, the interviewed graduates asserted that they had performed very well while remote working in general. Even Graduate C, who repeatedly expressed general ambivalence to their working arrangements, and Graduate D, who was again the least pleased with the remote setting, neglected to mention any adverse effects to their actual performance. The other two, meanwhile, brought up examples of being distracted in the office as well by coworkers and general workplace activity. This suggests that, while remote distractions could be a factor for workers, it is largely dependent on the living circumstances of each employee and in-office distractions, as previously stated, can be as much or more of a mitigating factor. It is also worth noting that the relative “freshness” of at-home distractions—that is to say, distractions that remote workers have not fully adapted to yet—could also play a role and that, given enough time, these distractions may dissipate and even cease to be a factor entirely.

6.3. *Employer Responsibility*

Employers played a significant role for the MAPW graduates while WFH. Graduates A and B, who seemed to have benefited the most from remote working, both complimented the practices of their managers. They both felt trusted to work remotely and experienced weekly meetings in which they could align their individual responsibilities with the overall goals of their assigned teams. Graduate

A, who previously joked that the amount of trust their manager placed in them was “terrifying,” would later mention this factor again when discussing the possibility of finding a new job to accommodate their remote preferences.

Graduate D, meanwhile, referenced feelings of loneliness when answering questions about their employer. These responses suggest that the employer plays a significant role in maintaining a worker’s job satisfaction and that, while all employers in the graduates’ previous or current roles were originally very resistant to WFH policies, allowing workers a choice and adopting a trusting relationship with them would pay great dividends with regards to their performance.

6.4. *Impactful Circumstances*

While it is true that, without the COVID-19 global pandemic, remote working never would have taken off in the rapid way that it did, the unusual circumstances of the past year may unfortunately muddle findings. It has become somewhat of an agreed-upon gag in pop culture that 2020 was a “bad” year (and 2021 only marginally better); the election in the United States was disproportionately divisive when compared to previous examples, resulting in a great deal of stress and anxiety for millions of Americans, and the constant threat of the coronavirus negatively impacting one’s health or the health of their loved ones was a looming shadow in many workers’ lives. Thrust into abnormal working arrangements against our will, largely separated from family and friends,

and forced to remain indoors, it is hardly surprising that so many might regard the previous year as an overall negative experience. This, when combined with the trend of “doomscrolling”—a reference to social media users habitually scrolling through seemingly dystopian news reports on their devices—amplified stressors to the point that those who might have regarded remote working as a positive experience could only view it as another unwelcome, unexpected challenge.

It is because of these unusual circumstances that we must acknowledge the role that 2020 played for workers—beyond just the uncertainties introduced by the pandemic. Graduate D mentioned this situation specifically, naming concerns over the world “burning” and the possibility of Donald Trump’s re-election as significant causes for feeling burnt out and unmotivated. If the circumstances surrounding 2020–2021 had this much of an effect on Graduate D’s WFH experience, then it is worth assuming that it may have affected others in a similar manner. The possibility that the pandemic’s role in the more WFH-positive graduates must also be considered. For example, if a worker enjoyed remote working purely because the ability to socialize was already taken away from them, then their feelings could develop in a different direction when working remotely over a “normal” year. That said, only half of the interviewed graduates mentioned COVID-19 or the election when prompted about their WFH experiences, so it is possible that it played less of a role for them.

6.5. *Initial Research Connections*

Many of the findings discovered through the graduate interview responses support research summarized in the capstone. Though WFH policies were already growing prior to the 2020 pandemic, they naturally exploded in popularity following stay-at-home and social distancing orders. The popularity of these policies also mirrors existing research; while it is important to not use the graduate responses as supporting statistical data due to the low sample size, the fact that only one of the four reported dissatisfaction with remote working (and that the graduate's support was likely affected by the aforementioned circumstances of the year) is likely not a coincidence. As mentioned in the white paper's introduction, only 59% of millennials reported successful WFH experiences, as opposed to the much higher rates of older generations (as high as 73%) ("Global Work-from-Home Experience Survey," 2020).

The role of distractions in remote and office workspaces were also in keeping with the findings of the white paper. Despite misconceptions otherwise, distractions in the office were far more common than when WFH. GWA discovered that remote workers experienced forty-three interruptions per day versus the seventy-eight they faced while in their offices (17). At home, these workers could isolate themselves from disruptions and create suitable, quiet spaces to perform their tasks within. Offices, meanwhile, often cultivated busy work environments in which individuals were prone to frequent interruptions from coworkers and struggled to ignore the background noise of an active workspace. Three of the graduates' responses match these findings, with two of

them mentioning the presence of coworkers as detrimental to their performance. The third, Graduate C, talked about their habit of speaking aloud at their desk which, while not necessarily a negative factor for their performance, could itself potentially be distracting for their coworkers. Graduate D's response was the only outlier. They stated that the presence of coworkers allowed for dynamic conversations in which innovation could occur and argued that this idea-friendly environment was unnecessarily stifled by remote workspaces. This did not match the findings of the GWA survey, which argued that creativity and innovation flourished more at home than when at work.

Confronting these distractions proved to be a matter of self-discipline and holding oneself accountable for both graduates and GWA survey respondents. Almost twice as many survey respondents referred to self-discipline as the most significant driver of WFH success when compared against other factors (collaboration with colleagues, career opportunities, limited interruptions, etc.) This is somewhat similar the graduate responses; Graduate A, as we recall, called themselves out for being tempted by at-home distractions and referred to self-accountability as the most important factor to continued good performance. The others, however, referenced the ability to collaborate with their peers, which came at a distant second to self-discipline in the GWA survey. When recommending methods for optimizing the WFH experience, the survey did specifically refer to maintaining schedule flexibility, which Graduate D called out as their only significant success factor while remote working.

Commute avoidance was another similarity between existing research and the responses of the MAPW graduates. Prior to COVID-19, commuters spent an average of five hours a week traveling to and from their office spaces. The survey estimates that this will drop to only three hours after the pandemic due to the higher rates of workers adopting a WFH approach to their careers (37). The “2017 State of Telecommuting” Report suggested that workers who spent even half of their workdays at home could save as much as \$11,000 per year (3). These statistics support three of the graduates’ responses, who mentioned commute avoidance as a significant role in their feelings about the WFH experience. Graduate A and B specifically referenced the free time the free time they gained from not having to drive to their jobs, which they then were able to devote to exercising and better preparing themselves for the day.

These benefits lead to the role of improved mental and physical health via the pandemic. Graduate A attributed their new workstyle as a factor to increased weight gain, calling for the need of a standing desk so they could correct back issues and “weak legs.” Graduates B and C held opposing views, as both expressed satisfaction with improved diets and additional time to exercise from not having to commute to their offices (and face temptations from fast food along the commute). This was in addition to financial savings, in which all but one graduate reported a substantial positive gain. The GWA survey had similar findings, reporting significant-to-minimal savings for 92% of respondents (32). Sixty-nine percent of respondents stated that they had experienced improvements to their overall well-being in the form of reduced stress, more sleep, and increased

exercise. Fifty-two percent reported having eaten healthier while working from home, while 48% claimed to have exercised more.

7. Chapter Six: Conclusion

It is important to note the shift from the original aims of this capstone to a narrowed examination of just graduates from the MAPW program and their experiences while remote working in the COVID-19 pandemic. While the original intent was to study generational gaps in WFH preparedness and productivity, the granular approach this capstone eventually adopted did provide some valuable insight. For example, the drop-off summarized in the capstone between generational success rates could have been attributed to disparities in generational upbringing or traditional workstyles facing new challenges in home environments. However, the actual cause could be as simple as the context in which remote learning took off; the pandemic and 2020 U.S. Presidential Election were both cited as sources of stress that, when combined with the already “disposable” nature of many young workers, became the perfect storm of anxiety for workers beginning a career in a time of economic strife, resulting in higher levels of tension in a situation that was already unfamiliar and uncertain.

This conclusion is supported by the findings from the MAPW graduate interviews. The one respondent who repeatedly expressed discontent with their WFH experience in 2020 stated that the stress brought about by the year’s events played an active role in their feelings. It is also worth noting that all graduates shared similar views when asked about the effectiveness of “blended workspaces”

that would allow workers the opportunity to work at home or in the office at will, though there was some variation in the suggested amount of allotted time for each arrangement. This would suggest that, rather than dismissing or universally adopting WFH practices, implementing programs that allowed for flexible workspaces could have a greater impact on the workforce's productivity and happiness.

More research on this topic would certainly be necessary before additional recommendations could be made regarding the WFH experience. It is difficult to separate the aforementioned tumultuousness of the events surrounding 2020–2021 from the findings discovered in both the capstone's research and interviews. Further surveys from a much larger sample size could provide valuable insight into the subject of remote working and would provide a clearer portrait of the future WFH landscape. Based on the information we have discovered so far, it is reasonable to suggest that trusting and supportive relationships between a manager and their employee play a significant role in the productivity and happiness of remote workers. This is in addition to other that were cited by the graduates, such as the availability of relevant technology. Organizations seeking to adopt WFH policies would do well to emulate these elements if they intend to ensure a happy and productive virtual workspace, and future workers would benefit from seeking out these factors while on the career path.

8. Works Cited

- “2017 State of Telecommuting.” FlexJobs Corporation, June 2017. Accessed 8 Jan. 2021.
- “Alternative Workplace Strategies: Fifth Biennial Global Benchmarking Study 2018.” *New Ways of Working*, June 2018, pp. 1-66. Accessed 20 Dec. 2020.
- Despinur, Dara, et al. “The Engagement and Working Satisfaction of Millennial Lecturers During the COVID-19 Pandemic: Differences in Gender Identity Perspectives.” *Systemic Reviews in Pharmacy*, vol. 12, no. 3, 2020, pp. 438-445. Accessed 10 Jan. 2021.
- Fried, Jason, and David H. Hansson. *Remote: Office Not Required*. New York, Crown Publishing Group, Oct. 2013.
- “Global Work-From-Home Experience Survey.” Global Workplace Analytics, May 2020. <https://globalworkplaceanalytics.com/global-work-from-home-experience-survey>. Accessed 1 Oct. 2020.
- Hershatter, Andrea, and Molly Epstein. “Millennials and the World of Work: An Organization and Management Perspective.” *Journal of Business and Psychology* vol. 25, 2010, pp.211–223. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-010-9160-y>. Accessed 14 Jan. 2021.
- Lister, Kate. “Telework and its effects in the United States.” *Telework in the 21st Century: An Evolutionary Perspective*, edited by Jon C. Messenger,

Edward Elgar Publishing, 15 Nov. 2019, pp. 128-170. Accessed 1 Oct. 2020.

Lister, Kate, and Tom Harnish. "Work on the Move: How Social, Leadership, and Technology Innovations are Transforming the Workplace in the Digital Economy." *IFMA Foundation*, 2016, pp. 136-147. Accessed 8 Jan. 2021.

"State of Remote Work." Owl Labs, 2020.

<https://resources.owlabs.com/state-of-remote-work/2020>. Accessed 8 Jan. 2021.

"Stress in America 2021: One Year Later, a New Wave of Pandemic Health Concerns." *American Psychological Association*, 11 Mar. 2021, www.apa.org/news/press/releases/stress/2021/one-year-pandemic-stress.

"Trump Declares National Emergency over Coronavirus." *BBC News*, BBC, 13 Mar. 2020, www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-51882381.

"Vyond the Surface - Summer 2020 | Vyond." Vyond, <https://think.vyond.com/vyond-the-surface-summer-2020>. Accessed 17 Jan. 2021.

World Health Organization [@WHO]. "Media briefing on #COVID19 with @DrTedros. #coronavirus. *Twitter*, 11 Mar. 2020, <https://twitter.com/WHO/status/1237774421307228160>.

United States, Congress, Senate, Senate Committee on Environment and Public Work. *Lessons Learned from Remote Working during COVID-19: Can the*

*Government Save Money Through Maximizing Efficient Use of Leased
Space?* 29 July 2020.

9. Acknowledgement

The data referenced in this capstone was collected under the Internal Review Board Research Project: “Effects of the COVID-19 Pandemic on MAPW Student Starting New Positions in a Socially Distanced World,” IRB-FY21-634, approved by the Kennesaw State University Institutional Review Board. Due to the minimal risk to participating human subjects’ study, the IRB was an “exempt” study. However, data from the interviews was referred to with limited identifying information.

10. Resume

JORDAN DOLLAR

TECHNICAL WRITER

EDUCATION

MA, PROFESSIONAL WRITING
KENNESAW STATE UNIVERSITY | 2018 - PRESENT
GPA: 4.0

BS, TECHNICAL COMMUNICATION
KENNESAW STATE UNIVERSITY | 2013 - 2017
GPA: 3.75

CONTACT

JORDANDOLLAR7@GMAIL.COM

(404) 218-2026

LINKEDIN.COM/IN/JORDAN-
DOLLAR/

PROFILE

Accomplished Technical Writer with extensive experience in the development and maintenance of software documentation. Detail-oriented with a demonstrated emphasis on producing accurate and accessible content in collaboration with Agile methodology

SKILLS

- Technical Writing
- Copyediting
- Workflow Analysis
- Jira Tracking Software
- Agile Methodologies
- Zendesk
- Google Suite
- Microsoft Office
- Adobe InDesign

EXPERIENCE

TECHNICAL WRITER - CONTRACT
COHESIVE SOLUTIONS | SEPT. 2020 - PRESENT

- Ensured legible and accurate documentation following organizational style guide.
- Oversaw and managed documentation workflows via Jira tracking software.

EDITOR - GRADUATE RESEARCH ASSISTANT
KENNESAW STATE UNIVERSITY | AUGUST 2018 - DEC. 2020

- Collaborated with three different scientific journals to improve overall content readability and accessibility.
- Regularly coordinated with global network of researchers to ensure adherence to journal guidelines.

TECHNICAL WRITER
ONETRUST LLC | DEC. 2018 - JULY 2019

- Developed and maintained software documentation on intense Agile schedule across nine different modules.
- Led the development of third-party interactive training service Userlane for integration into OneTrust products.
- Coordinated with product managers to translate complicated product workflows into intuitive, instructional videos.

TECHNICAL WRITING INTERN
SOVOS COMPLIANCE LLC | JUNE. 2017 - AUGUST 2017

- Produced and maintained software documentation for international client usage.
- Developed instructional data sheets for client and employee training purposes.